SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

10th Year of Publication

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Vol. X, No. 6 | P.O. Box 6226A, Washington, D.C. 20015 | April 1, 1980

R&D Gets Hacked in Budget-Balancing Drive

Though it's too early to forecast the duration of Washington's latest bout of budget-cutting fever, the stated intent of the Carter White House is to cut not only the budget plan that he presented in January, but also to take back some of the money that was voted for the current fiscal year.

And with an election-minded Congress now straining to outdo the President in demonstrations of flinthearted frugality, there's no vestige of checks and balances in this competition. Though Mr. Carter has repeatedly stated — most recently in his last Budget Message — that research and development are so essential to the nation's future that they merit "real" growth even in a time of austerity, that pronouncement has swiftly disappeared in the cost-cutting, anti-inflationary stampede. The Administration's past performances on a wide assortment of matters offers the real possibility that R&D might just as swiftly be resurrected and reaccorded privileged treatment, but there's no way of knowing whether this is in the cards.

Atkinson Quits NSF

For San Diego Post---Page 4

What the record shows is that in pursuit of that "real" growth, Mr. Carter in January proposed a 13 per cent increase in federal R&D spending for fiscal 1981, which begins next October 1. For reasons that defy kind interpretation, the President's budgetmakers unrealistically predicated that growth on the expectation that inflation would be running at a rate of 10 per cent in the new year. This was acutely absurd then, and it now even more so — what with the rate computed at 18 per cent and going up. Mr. Carter's response was to prescribe "bitter medicine" and issue a call for discipline, which is supposed to be manifested in, among other things, a $13-to-$14-billion cut in the supposedly barebones budget that he presented as recently as 10 weeks ago.

The President, however, has so far refrained from publicly stating the items on his so-called hit list, an omission which has evoked nasty interpretations — such as that, in the thick of the primary season, he's out to

(Continued on Page 2)

NSF Scrubs 70 Fellowships

The cut-the-spending mood now pervading Washington caused the National Science Foundation last week to yank from its mailroom letters notifying 70 graduate students that they had been awarded NSF fellowships.

The 70, who will never know they got so close to the three-year, $4320-a-year awards (plus $3400 for the university accepting them), were among 460 graduate students who were each selected to receive what is formally known as a "letter of offer" for the fellowship.

But, though the letters were ready to go out, the coming budget axe led NSF's money managers to conclude that some serious pruning was necessary. A policy decision was made to keep in force all previously made commitments for the three-year awards. Then, the staff re-examined the 460 new awards, going over the ratings produced by the National Academy of Sciences, which handles the chore of reviewing and evaluating NSF's training applications.

According to an NSF official, the final cutting was made on the basis of scores, geographical and disciplinary distribution, and male-female ratios.

In Brief

Under sharp questioning from Eisenhower Science Adviser George Kistiakowsky following a speech March 21 at Harvard, Carter Science Adviser Frank Press fell back to a last line of defense: *Science & Government Report's* Greenberg, he told his audience, had reported favorably on his performance and the science policies of the Carter Administration. True, but. . .

Smarting from a biting New York Times *editorial on March 1 that described the National Academy of Science's big energy report (CONAES, as it's abbreviated) as providing a "sad performance" in its negative evaluation of solar energy, NAS has been in a tizzy preparing a response. That's been hard to do, however, since the* Times' *criticism, supported by an analysis prepared by the White House Council on Environmental Quality, correctly points out that the put-down of solar's future is unsupported by any data in the mammoth report.*

The Administration's loudly proclaimed industrial innovation initiatives may be especially vulnerable to the budget knife, since they're both new and lacking a constituency. Says one top science official: "It looks like they're going to get hit very hard."

. . .Ceilings Sought for Spending by NIH

(Continued from Page 1)

reap the political benefits of thriftiness without collecting the liabilities of taking anyone's money away.

In any case, the Congress, taking its cue from the White House, has gone off on its own savings spree, determined to outdo the President in cutting back on both future and present spending plans.

For this purpose, and in an atmosphere of such immense confusion that daily news accounts on the proceedings have wildly varied over what's been decided, the Congressional budget committees have been going at it in marathon sessions.

Acting on Chairman Robert N. Giaimo's (D-Conn.) recommendation, for example, the House Budget Committee approved a $16-billion cut in spending for fiscal 1981. The House proposal included a $100-million reduction in scientific research, a $1.5-billion cut in energy programs, a $700-million slice from the natural resources and environment segment, and a $100-million drop in the agriculture budget — no good news for researchers in any field.

The Senate Budget Committee was to begin work last week on its final spending ceilings for the current fiscal year and its spending targets for the fiscal year that begins October 1, with both targets expected to be below current levels of spending.

With these cut-and-slash acts pushing budgetary confusion to an all-time high in the capital, the question of how much of that US Treasury money is actually available for spending was further obscured by Congress's refusal to approve health-spending recisions that the Administration sought for the current fiscal year. Taking a hardline against the President, Congress refused to act on the President's proposal to rescind $98 million to aid health-professions education.

A $81.6-million recission in health-professions capitation funds would have meant a cut of $784 per student for medical schools, osteopathy schools, and dental schools. Cuts were also scheduled for students in veterinary schools, optometry schools, podiatry schools, and pharmacy schools. Moreover, the Administration also had requested a $16.5-million reduction in loans to health-professions students.

The request for reductions in the current federal health-training budget was effectively killed when the House Labor-HEW appropriations subcommittee voted, 7-3, to take no action on the proposal. By law, Congress must approve a recission request within 45 working days after the President submits it.

Shortly after the appropriations panel acted, a House authorizing committee agreed on a plan that may mean bad news for biomedical researchers. For the first time, the panel would assign specific spending ceilings to each of the 11 National Institutes of Health. Opposed by the Administration, the ceilings were contained in HR 6522, a measure that would extend the life of the institutes through fiscal 1983. Currently, only the National Cancer Institute and the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute have spending ceilings established by law. Spending for the other institutes are determined by what the Administration requests each year and can convince Congressional appropriations committees to approve.

The Administration opposed the change because it would not give NIH enough flexibility in determining how much each institute could spend annually. Researchers, on the other hand, opposed the measure because, they argued, the spending levels the measure would authorize are not enough to keep pace with inflation.

The balancing act was also somewhat thrown off this

(Continued on Page 3)

Commerce Renames Science Office

The Commerce Department's Office of Science and Technology has been relabeled the Office of Productivity, Technology, and Innovation in connection with the Administration's stated interest in expanding all three of the title items. The newly named office, headed by Assistant Secretary Jordan Baruch, who headed the old office, will direct the Commerce Department's share of the innovation program announced last fall by the Administration. (See SGR Vol. IX, No. 19, "Innovation Plan: After Great Study — A Mouse.")

© Science & Government Report, Inc., 1980

ISSN 0048-9581

Editor and Publisher
Daniel S. Greenberg

Contributing Editor
Anne Roark

Associate Publisher
Wanda J. Reif

Circulation Manager
Susan Burke

European Correspondents
Michael Kenward (London); Francois Seguier (Paris)

Independently published by *Science & Government Report,* Inc., twice monthly, except once each in January, June & July. Annual Subscription: Institutions, $89.50 (two years, $168.50); individuals, $48.50 (two years, $82.50). Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St., N.W., Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. Second class postage paid at Washington, DC. Please address all subscription correspondence to Box 6226A, Northwest Station, Washington, DC 20015. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on Xerox University Microfilms.

. . .$50-Million Cut Planned in NSF Spending

(Continued from Page 2)

month by a recommendation by the House Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Technology that the Administration's budget for the National Science Foundation's fiscal 1981 be raised from $1.057 billion to $1.079 billion.

While many members of the panel were strongly in favor of increased support for the Foundation, they agreed to reconsider their action if the White House ended up asking for substantial reductions in the Foundation's 1981 Budget.

Although not as great as some special-interest groups had feared, the overall spending cuts proposed by various Congressional committees were expected to come as a blow to educators and researchers who have argued that their programs are "anti-inflationary," even if they are costly. What gave them heart was that in his Budget Message last January, Mr. Carter urged increased support for education and research because both, he said, could help boost the nation's productivity.

Documents obtained from the White House show, for example, that the President would now like to cut at least $89 million from NIH's pending budget, plus the $98 million cut planned for this year.

Since Congress has already rejected the $98-million cut, it was unclear last week how the Administration might try to hold down spending for biomedical research.

For NSF, the budget documents showed the Administration's preference for reductions of $50 million. That would include a cancellation of the research-facility upgrading program, a delay in expansion of industry-university cooperative research, and a deferral of 25 per cent of the balance of 1980 science education programs.

The largest single savings — approximately $20 million — would come from what the budget documents call a "phasedown" of the Foundation's role in most applied research. Perhaps the most controversial savings proposed in the early budget documents would be to provide only a 9 per cent cost-of-living increase for basic research.

A "less acceptable" cut, the documents stated, would be to cancel the Ocean-Margin Drilling Program, a proposed research effort highly touted last January by the Administration.

The budget documents indicated that the proposed cuts for NSF and NIH were "sensitive items," presumably because those agencies administer the government's principal basic-research and biomedical-research programs. But, if the documents are any reflections of this thinking, the Administration did not want to stop there.

The White House was also apparently considering a $13-million cut in alcohol, drug abuse, and mental health research; a $10-million cut in nurse training, a $12-million reduction in grants to land-grant colleges. Support for the Department of Energy would also be slashed by $137.9-million, although only a fraction of that cut would affect research.

While they are trying to decide on what goes overboard, many of the research community's special-interest groups will be squirming in their seats — wishing, perhaps, that they had not cried wolf so many times before. For this time that they really do need help, if they are going to get out of this budget mangle with minimum damage.—Anne Roark

(The author is an Assistant Editor of *The Chronicle of Higher Education.*)

"Agenda" Study Takes up R&D

The only science-related item in the President's March 14 anti-inflation message was in a fuzzy sentence calling for "long-term structural changes to encourage productivity, savings and research and development." The object, he said, is to improve the nation's productivity, and he said, "I'm asking my Presidential Commission on an Agenda for the 1980s . . . to develop recomendations for revitalizing our nation's economy."

What's this all about?

White House sources tell SGR that the R&D reference should not be interpreted as suggesting anything new is under consideration beyond the already much-discussed tax-related incentives for boosting industrial R&D. But despite the length of the dialog, no decision has been made on what, if anything, to do, since it's still strongly contended within the Administration that R&D is at most a minor problem in the nation's current economic situation.

As for the Commission that the President referred to: The White House announced its creation last fall, with William J. McGill, who is retiring from the presidency of Columbia University in July, as chairman. The Commission is similar to the Commission on National Goals that was established by President Eisenhower and the wide-ranging set of task forces that Lyndon Johnson set up shortly after becoming President.

Carter's Commission, which has been listed for a budget of at least $2 million and a staff of 20-30, was set up with a list of 20 establishment types as its charter members. However, apart from the initial announcement and the President's March 14 reference to the Commission, it's gone unnoticed in Washington.

Atkinson Quits NSF to Head UC San Diego

Richard C. Atkinson has resigned the directorship of the National Science Foundation to become Chancellor of the San Diego campus of the University of California.

In the tradition of NSF chiefs going off to elevated posts in academe, Atkinson will succeed Chancellor William D. McElroy, who held the top NSF post from 1969-72, before taking the San Diego job. McElroy, a biologist who was at Johns Hopkins when Washington beckoned, was the beneficiary of an unprecedented no-confidence vote by his faculty last June, whereupon he vowed not to resign, and then just two months later did. At issue was the faculty's contention that McElroy did not consult with it on appointments and other academic matters.

Atkinson, 51, has had a relatively smooth time during his tour at the Foundation first as Deputy Director, to which Gerald Ford appointed him in June 1975. He became Acting Director a year later, when Director Guy Stever was appointed to head the revived White House science office. Upon coming to the presidency in January 1977, Carter let Atkinson dangle there for a time in the titular limbo of the acting directorship. But Carter and his helpers finally got around to recognizing that a good man was already in place, and that it would be desirable to give him a full-fledged appointment as Director, which it did in April 1977. One spur to this was Atkinson's polite insistence that he'd be heading back to Stanford, from which he was on leave, if the matter wasn't favorably settled quickly.

The retention of a Republican appointee also signalled that the new Administration regarded the non-mission science agencies as beyond partisan politics. Since this was in sharp contrast to the political coloration that Nixon and his henchmen tried to put on NSF and the National Institutes of Health, it was particularly appealing to the Carter White House and its strivings for a politically pure image.

Since Atkinson, a psychologist, was the first social scientist to head NSF in its 25-years of existence, this professional uniqueness stirred a good deal of interest at the time of his appointment. But it's difficult to identify any difference that this has made for the social sciences. They still rate a tiny slice of the NSF budget, and leaders of the social sciences still grouse about the need to get a government-financed agency of their own — which is, of course, out of the question in these austere times.

Apart from occasional collisions with the irascible Senator Proxmire (who must be tolerated because he presides, even if ineffectively, over NSF's budget in the Senate), Atkinson has enjoyed especially good relations on Capitol Hill. He has had a good working relationship with White House Science Adviser Frank Press, who, in collaboration with Atkinson, sold the Office of Management and Budget last year on putting NSF over the

(Continued on Page 5)

Budget Turmoil Makes Parting with NSF Much Easier

There's a surprising element in Director Richard C. Atkinson's decision to leave the National Science Foundation — and it may be related to the immense confusion that the governmental process has been thrown into by Jimmy Carter's grandstanding budget plays and his Congressional imitators.

Last year, when the University of Southern California was wooing Atkinson for its presidency, he indicated that he wanted a decision before December. If he stayed on as late as that, he said, he'd feel responsible for sticking with the job to shepherd the NSF budget through the Congressional mill — a process that often runs to late summer and even beyond.

In any case, Atkinson and USC failed to come to terms, and he went into the budget season fully expecting to remain with NSF, if not to the end of his term, in 1983, at least through the fiscal 1981 budget season.

Two events then came together. On February 26, David Saxon, President of the University of California, told Atkinson that he was a prime candidate for the job of Chancellor at San Diego; Atkinson then in the midst of trying to persuade Congress to approve NSF's first billion-plus budget, said no. But in the meantime, staff work was quietly proceeding within the Administration for the budget-cutting derby that the President announced on March 14 — with details to come later.

Atkinson says that his acceptance of the San Diego job is simply in response to a fine professional opportunity. But close associates say it's that and more.

With the original 1981 budget now in mid-stream of the Congressional appropriations process, where, as is the custom, it must be defended as a rockbottom necessity, the new assignment for executive agency chiefs is to defend the new and truncated budget (whenever that's ready) as what's necessary for national well-being.

From that perspective in Washington, San Diego looks very good.

. . .No Frontrunner for Filling NSF Directorship

(Continued from Page 4)

$1-billion mark for the first time.

Congress balked a bit at that, and finally came in with an appropriation that was symbolically a few millions under the magic figure. But these things take time, and in the budget that the President submitted in January for fiscal 1981 (beginning next October 1), NSF was over the billion mark by nearly $150 million. Carter's election-campaign-induced obsession with budget cutting will cost NSF some of that money, but Atkinson merits recognition as the NSF chief who kept the money coming in during a difficult few years.

By law, the NSF directorship is a six-year Presidential appointment, with the advice and consent of the Senate; the key Congressional group is the Labor and Human Resources Subcommittee on Health and Scientific Research, chaired by Senator Kennedy. He's long been a close observer and friend of NSF matters. The National Science Board, the 24-member so-called policy-making body that is organizationally situated atop NSF, may, by statute, suggest candidates to the President, but he's not obliged to accept the Board's list.

Pending formal acceptance of his resignation, Atkinson isn't saying when he's leaving. McElroy plans to quit in July as Chancellor, but will remain at San Diego as a member of the faculty.

As for a successor for Atkinson: The chief presidential adviser on that will be Science Adviser Frank Press. It's likely that a successor will be sought quickly, since NSF Deputy Director George Pimentel is also planning to leave, to return to UC Berkeley. Various names are being discussed, but SGR is advised that the process isn't close to final choice or even a short list.

It could be that at this late stage in the presidential term, it will be extremely difficult to persuade a suitable replacement to take the job. In the back of the mind of any Carter appointee for the NSF post must be the possibility of a Reagan victory, and whether, even with the six-year appointment, the post would be tenable under the ideology that Mr. Regan is espousing.

Golden Fleece Proxmire Settles Out of Court

Senator William Proxmire has agreed to pay $10,000 in an out-of-court settlement to a Golden Fleece victim who dragged the grandstanding legislator all the way to the Supreme Court, and won.

The $10,000, in the Senator's own money, will be paid to Ronald Hutchinson, a Michigan behavorial researcher, whom Proxmire pilloried in 1975 for allegedly doing silly things with federal research funds.

Hutchinson, who was researching frustration and aggressiveness in monkeys by wiring them up to record teeth-clenching, took offense when Proxmire said that the scientist's studies "should make the taxpayers as well as his monkeys grind their teeth." Though Proxmire has made similarly unkind remarks about other government-supported activities, he rendered himself legally vulnerable in the Hutchinson case by having made the nasty statements off of Capitol Hill, where he would be protected by Congressional immunity.

Hutchinson, a researcher at a Michigan mental hospital, sued for $8 million, contending that Proxmire had made the remarks in press releases and that in such a circumstance, he was not performing a legislative function. The lower federal courts ruled in the Senator's favor. The Supreme Court, however, took a different view of the immunity matter, and also rejected Proxmire's contention that by virtue of having applied for and accepted a federal research grant, Hutchinson was a "public figure," and, therefore, was fair game for the Senator's comments.

Hutchinson and the Senator then returned to the lower courts, but rather than carry on with the proceedings, agreed to a settlement that called for Proxmire to pay Hutchinson $10,000 and to issue a soothing statement concerning his 1975 remarks about the researcher. The statement says:

"I stated that all of the public funding was given to Dr. Hutchinson of Kalamazoo State Hospital. While Dr. Hutchinson directed the research, the federal funding went to the State of Michigan for this research. Dr. Hutchinson received his salary as an employee of the state."

Proxmire continues: "I stated that Dr. Hutchinson's projects were extremely similar and perhaps duplicative. I know of no evidence that Dr. Hutchinson ever received extra money for work that duplicated earlier work that had already been funded.

"In my press release, I stated that Dr. Hutchinson made a fortune from his monkeys. While the amount of federal expenditure was large and provided support for Dr. Hutchinson's research for a number of years, the fact is that Dr. Hutchinson did not make a personal fortune."

For Senator Proxmire, the self-proclaimed guardian of the public purse, legal fees in this case will amount to nearly $125,000 — to be paid by the US Senate.

Grim Future Seen for Small Private College

Pre-publication data from the government's forthcoming *Projections of Education Statistics to 1988-89* forecast a perilous decade for small private colleges.

"The declining birthrate of the 1960s will soon begin to affect all college enrollments," according to an analysis contained in the report, now being prepared for publication by the Education Division of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. (HEW says publication is scheduled for "this summer," and that it can't be more precise than that.) "But," continues the analysis, "small private schools, which largely depend upon 18-to-24-year-old students, will be hardest hit."

The downward trend has been partially offset by another, according to the report: An increase in the number of students over age 25, especially women. But the two-year schools are getting most of this new crop of students; in 1977, the over-25s totaled 39 per cent of undergraduate enrollments at two-year institutions, compared with only 22 per cent in four-year institutions.

The report adds that "Since many older, part-time students enroll in public two-year institutions, the enrollments in these schools is expected to increase from 3.9 million in 1978 to 4.2 million in 1988. Four-year schools, both public and private, will bear most of the burden of declining enrollments: public four-year schools dropping from 4.9 to 4.6 million and private four-year decreasing from 2.3 to 2.1 million. Most public four-year schools have relatively large enrollments and should be able to survive the coming enrollment declines. But there are many small, private four-year schools, and should enrollment declines be concentrated in these schools, many of them could be faced with closure."

Projections, produced by the National Center for Education Statistics, formerly was published annually, but, with the forthcoming edition, is on a biannual schedule.

Full-time equivalent enrollment in all institutions of higher education, by enrollment level of student and type of institution: United States, 1970 to 1988

(In thousands)

Year	Total	Undergraduate		Graduate		First-professional	
		4-year	2-year	4-year	2-year	4-year	2-year
1970	6738	4458	1518	599	0	163	0
1971	7149	4632	1719	613	0	185	0
1972	7254	4587	1847	622	0	198	0
1973	7453	4560	2014	669	0	210	0
1974	7805	4670	2199	710	0	226	0
1975	8481	4914	2579	756	2	229	0
1976	8313	4838	2461	780	1	234	0
1977	8415	4919	2479	775	1	240	0
1978	8361	4924	2410	778	1	248	0
			PROJECTIONS				
1979	8539	4916	2587	788	0	248	0
1980	8595	4909	2640	794	0	252	0
1981	8627	4892	2675	802	0	258	0
1982	8595	4846	2691	800	0	259	0
1983	8521	4769	2689	802	0	262	0
1984	8394	4663	2665	803	0	264	0
1985	8255	4550	2639	801	0	265	0
1986	8114	4434	2617	799	0	264	0
1987	8013	4354	2604	792	0	263	0
1988	7967	4317	2608	782	0	260	0

SOURCES: — U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, National Center for Education Statistics, *Opening (Fall) Enrollment in Higher Education.*

Proxmire Insists Great Care Goes in Fleece Awards

The following is excerpted from a March BioScience *Q. and A. with Senator Proxmire concerning the Golden Fleece awards:*

Q. For some Golden Fleece Awards, people have said that, although the title might be silly and esoteric, the research itself is quite important.

A. We would never consider giving a Golden Fleece just because of the title. We go behind the title very painstakingly. We discuss it with the agency to find out the basis for it and their justification for it; in many cases, we've gone to the people who've done the principal work and talked with them about it. There are all kinds of titles that sound funny and peculiar . . . but they may be very good . . . At any rate, we never would and we never have seized on a catchy title. . .

Q. Do you think there's a necessary tradeoff in terms of federal support of scientists on the one hand and what scientists should be doing [for society] in return on the other?. . .

A. . . .When you're doing basic research, you can't defend it in terms of its immediate benefits, by its very definition, but you should be able to show that basic research, over the years . . . has been and can be expected to be useful and productive . . . I have a letter here from a consulting physicist who's a PhD, who says, "Enclosed is a copy of a page from the current number of *Physics Today*." It shows advertisements for faculty openings . . . Here's what one of the ads says for the Department of Physics, University of Virginia: "Ability to generate grant support is a requirement. . ." (A)nother ad: "A successful applicant will be expected to initiate an independent research program and generate grant support." This guy subtitles his letter, "The Order of the Itchy Palm."

OSHA Sets Semiconductor Study

The booming semiconductor industry has so far escaped any systematic study of health hazards to its workers. However, now both the National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) and the California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (CalOSHA) are planning major industry-wide investigations of the industry.

NIOSH officials will look at health and safety in semiconductor manufacturers throughout the country, while CalOSHA will concentrate on Silicon Valley, the heart of the industry in the US. NIOSH would like to do the work itself, but manpower shortages may force the institute to contract out the investigation. CalOSHA staff will do their own study. Potential hazards in the industry include exposure to dopant gases — diborane, phosphine and arsine.

In Print

Better Communication Could Help Clear up Confusion over "Silly" Research Grants, report by the General Accounting Office to the House Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Technology, inspired by Congressional sniping at odd-sounding titles of NSF-supported social-science projects. Following what seems to have been a needlessly lengthy inquiry, GAO concluded that the difficulties could be reduced by greater clarity in staff recommendations for awards and in summaries of completed research; 34 pages, available without charge (specify report PAD-80-46) from: GAO, Room 1518, 441 G St. Nw., Washington, DC 20548.

Federal Coordinating Council for Science, Engineering, and Technology, report of activities, 1976-79, tells in condensed form about the work of many little-heard-of committees and coordinating bodies connected to the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy; subjects include atmosphere and oceans, human nutrition research, dam safety, automotive R&D, and intellectual property and information: 55 pages, available without charge from: Office of Science and Technology Policy, Executive Office of the President, Washington, DC 20500.

Subscription Form

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station
Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

☐Renew my subscription; ☐Check enclosed

☐Enter my subscription; ☐Please bill

Institutional subscribers: one year, $89.50☐; two years, $168.50☐

Individual subscribers: one year, $48.50☐; two years, $82.50☐

(Overseas airmail, $17.50 per year additional.)

Name _____

Address _____

_____ Zip _____

News Notes: Medical Enrollments, OTA, Etc.

Medical education established all kinds of records in the 1978-79 academic year, according to figures compiled from the nation's 125 medical schools by the American Medical Association.

Total enrollment reached 62,754, an increase of 2804 over the previous year. New enrollments totalled 16,620, a one-year increase of 486. The overall number of women was up to 15,293, which was 920 more than in 1977-78. About one-quarter of all medical students are women — an extremely sharp increase in relatively few years.

The only decline reported by the AMA was in the number of applicants. These totalled 36,636, a drop of about 4,000 from the previous year. The all-time record for applicants was established in 1974-75, when 42,624 sought admission.

•

Barry Commoner says he's leaving Washington University, St. Louis, where he's been for over 30 years, to join the faculty of Queens College, New York, next September. Commoner, who has long mixed research and environmental agitation, directs Washington University's Center for the Biology of Natural Systems, and is often referred to as the presidential candidate of the Citizen's Party.

Newly appointed to the Technology Assessment Advisory Council, a 12-member group that serves the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment:

Claire T. Dedrick, Commissioner of the California Public Utilities Commission;

Carl N. Hodges, Director of the University of Arizona Environmental Research Laboratory;

Rachel McCulloch, Associate Professor of Economics, University of Wisconsin;

Lewis Thomas, President, Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center.

The new appointments, for four years each, fill vacancies created by the expiration of terms of Ronald Davenport, Hazel Henderson, Levi Leathers, and Ed Wenk.

Other Council members are: J. Fred Bucy, James C. Fletcher, Gilbert Gude, Charles N. Kimball, John T. McAlister, Frederick C. Robbins, Elmer B. Staats, and Jerome B. Wiesner.

•

Official opening day for the new US Department of Education: May 7, with the occasion to be observed with yet-to-be-announced activities under the heading of "Salute to Learning Day."

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station
Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

Second class postage paid at Washington, D.C.

00006 9999
XEROX UNIV MICROFILMS
300 N ZEEB RD

ANN ARBOR MI 48106